

Holland Township Planning Board

Minutes of the Special Meeting

July 15, 2019

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman Rader:

“I call to order the July 15, 2019 Meeting of the Holland Township Planning Board. Adequate notice of this meeting was given pursuant to the Open Public Meeting Act Law by the Planning Board Secretary on December 13, 2018 by:

1. Posting such notice on the bulletin board at the Municipal Building.
2. Published in the December 13, 2018 issue of the Hunterdon County Democrat
3. Faxed to the Express Times for informational purposes only.

Flag Salute

Chairman Rader asked all to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance

Identification of those at the podium

Present: Dan Bush, Ken Grisewood, Dave Grossmueller, Michael Keady, Dan Rader, Duane Young, John Gallina, Esq., Rick Roseberry, Engineer, and Maria Elena Jennette Kozak, Secretary.

Excused Absent: Mike Miller, Carl Molter, Thomas Scheibener, Darlene Green, Planner, Court Reporter Lucille Grozinski, CSR (The professionals are excused per Chairman Rader)

Let the record show there is a quorum.

Minutes

There were no minutes to approve.

Discussion

There was no Discussion scheduled to discuss

Old Business:

There was no Old Business scheduled to discuss.

New Business:

- Holland Township School- Block 6 Lot 61.02 and 65 - - a parking lot project for courtesy review with consistency with Master Plan and waiver for Site Plan Application

Let the record show that Ken Grisewood recused himself and sat in the public.

The Holland School Attorney William Sullivan was present. Attorney Sullivan explained the project and that the school did get County Planning Approval as the project is on a County road. He believes that the Planning Board needs to only review as a courtesy for consistency with the Master Plan. He did receive Engineer Roseberry's memo dated July 14, 2019.

TO: Members of the Holland Township Planning Board

From: C. Richard Roseberry, PE, PP, CME

Date: July 14, 2019

Re: Site Plan Application
Holland Township Board of Education
Block 6 Lots 61.02 and 65
Holland Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey

MC Project HLT-001

Dear Members of the Township Planning Board:

This office has received a set of plans and drainage calculations for a parking lot expansion to the Holland Township School. We understand the applicant will be seeking a site plan waiver at the July 15th Planning Board meeting. As the plans were only received late last week, I am providing an abbreviated letter with technical comments only.

Technical Comments pertaining to the Site Plan:

- 1) The proposed parking lot is situated in the Highlands Conservation Environmentally Constrained Subzone. The existing school is located in the Existing Community Zone. The applicant shall obtain either an Exemption or Consistency Determination from the Highlands as part of this project. It appears that this project may meet the criteria for Exemption #6.
- 2) The “Do Not Enter” signs should be relocated to the east side drive aisle, where the potential exists for vehicles travelling east to turn right into oncoming traffic.
- 3) The drive aisle along the western parking area is insufficient width at 20’. For 90 degree parking, the drive aisle is required to be 24’ minimum.
- 4) Are the arrows shown on the site plan intended to be painted on the pavement? If so, details should be provided on the plans.
- 5) A “One-Way” signs shall be placed at the end of the middle drive aisle at the eastern end to direct traffic to the left.
- 6) No landscaping is proposed with this application.
- 7) With the additional on-site parking, the applicant’s engineer shall confirm that there are sufficient handicap accessible parking spaces on-site. The required number of accessible parking spaces is a percentage of the total number of parking spaces.

Technical Comments pertaining to the Stormwater Plan:

- 8) The project meets the definition of a “major development” according to the NJDEP regulations and the Holland Township Stormwater Management Ordinance. As such, the applicant is required to provide improvements to stormwater rate, water quality, and groundwater recharge.

The applicant is satisfying the stormwater rate reduction requirements of the Ordinance, but is asking for a waiver of providing water quality and groundwater recharge. The NJDEP regulations and the Holland Ordinance do not permit waivers from these requirements without mitigation being provided. As Holland does not have a mitigation plan, the applicant is required to comply with the regulations.
- 9) The storm sewers are designed to the 25-year storm event. Calculations shall be provided for the 100-year event to confirm the stormwater will be conveyed to the detention basin.
- 10) The Geotechnical report indicates solid bedrock at elevation 357’. The plan lists the bottom of the detention basin at elevation 338’. It appears the geotechnical report assumed an incorrect ground elevation. This discrepancy should be corrected. Regardless of the discrepancy, it appears that the bottom of the detention basin will require blasting due to its depth. We would recommend an alternate (shallower) design be considered.
- 11) There are several areas on the plan that show the difference between the top of curb and bottom of curb to be greater than 6”. These discrepancies should be corrected.
- 12) Cross sections and calculations for the diversion swale on the south side of the site should be provided to verify capacity and stability.
- 13) The stormwater report does not address the non-structural stormwater strategies required for a major development application.
- 14) Once revised, the applicant shall provide a completed NJ Groundwater Recharge Spreadsheet.
- 15) Calculations shall be provided to show the project meets the 80% Total Suspended Solids (TSS) removal requirements of the Regulations.
- 16) The drainage report shall include a Maintenance Manual in accordance with the Regulations.
- 17) The area near the entrance where the storm pipes converge will be a relatively deep depression at 4.5’ deep. The plan is missing the contour lines for elevations 338’ and 339’. Also, FES-2 has a rim elevation of 343.30 listed, but the ground contour is less than 340’. This area shall be re-analyzed so that the contours show acceptable coverage over the pipes and a hazardous condition is not created by having a deep depression. Safety improvements should be considered.
- 18) Approval of this plan is required from the Hunterdon County Planning Board and Hunterdon County Soil Conservation District.

If anyone has any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Additional school representation included: Brian P. McCarthy, School Business Administrator/Board Secretary, Besrick Plummer of B & G Engineering LLC.

Witness #1 – Besrick Plummer – licensed Engineer who graduated in 1986. He has been active since 1991 in Civil Engineering in New Jersey.

Engineer Plummer has been involved in the proposed Holland Township School Improvement project for a while. He addressed comments that the County had made. The initial concept had a third driveway proposed off County Route 519 which was rejected by the County. Currently there is one ingress and one egress which the school is in favor of modifying to create a better flow for buses as well as visitors. Basically they are looking for a safer traffic pattern into and out of the school. Currently there is a meadow to the side of the parking lot that is being used as an overflow parking lot. The goal of widening the driveway and redirecting the flow will have a net increase of 41 parking spaces. The plans stated 46 new spaces are being provided but they will lose some of existing parking spaces to redirect the flow so the net increase is 41. This will accommodate growth in staff as well as visitor access. The County requested more right of way on frontage and there will be sight easements on the entrance and the exit required by the County for improved visibility. The current overflow parking is grass with a gravel opening. In regards to Stormwater, the County wanted flow reductions before tapping into their system. There were meetings to discuss how it should be done and the County also wanted a physical break to show exact responsibility in regards to maintenance and repairs. They also had to double check the flow and in the opinion of Engineer Plummer the system is way over requirements. He further explained that the road is crowned and only half is entering the site. Engineer Plummer believes that all DEP requirements are satisfied and that other Stormwater Management controls in effect are exempt since the school improvement project is NOT a development project. The site is clay and the County does not recommend recharge in certain areas of the County because of the clay and shale. The above ground basin system is not good for a school for obvious safety reasons aside from the fact that they are often not maintained properly. Discussion about a better design for a school took place. The project also requires Hunterdon County Soil Conservation (HCSD) approval and they are very stringent. HCSD is requesting a 100 foot stone pad. Discussion also included site lighting with Engineer Plummer stating that there are no houses in close proximity so glare should not be an issue. There is natural vegetation that isolates headlights or even the lights themselves.

More discussion took place regarding Engineer Roseberry's memo. The school is exempt from Highlands Council review. #2 can be done. #3 if they make 24 then 2 more spots would be lost and there have been no incidents demonstrating the need. #4 yes arrows can be provided. #5 yes up top. #6 the landscaping is only grass and no trees are being added. There are a lot of trees on the west side of the land and more to the side with trees and evergreens. #7 there is a formula for handicapped. #8 satisfied. #9 this is a good comment. The pipe system designed for a 25 year storm which makes little sense if designs should be on a 100 year design basis. Mr. Roseberry is suggesting checking for 100 year and all agree that if larger is needed then build larger. #10 the soil investigation was done. One boring in bedrock. There was added discussion about a underground detention basin being about 8 or 9 feet deep and would require removing rocks. #11 typos will be corrected. #12 Good comment and will be provided. #13 he has the information and will put on the report. #14 they prefer not to do recharge. #15 they prefer not to do. #16 yes they will provide. The manual is important as it will remind people what needs to be done. #17 the contour change can be done. #18 County Planning Board and HCSD approvals are a yes.

The school wants to move forward and the County agencies have been aware of this project.

Engineer Roseberry explained that if the project was a major development then no waivers would be granted and an applicant is not exempt from Stormwater and the DEP does not provide exemptions. If the Planning Board grants a waiver then mitigation needs to be done and explained. Engineer Roseberry explained that Holland Township is required to provide an annual report regarding their Tier B Municipal Stormwater General Permit which asks Holland if they are enforcing the rules and regulations. Our response is always YES and a waiver to protocol is NOT acceptable. Ground Water Recharge is a specific task and Holland Township cannot jeopardize their permit. Attorney Sullivan agrees that if this was a development project then the comments are correct but that this project is actually in a grey area and should be viewed for consistency with the Holland Township Master Plan. The school believes they have shown us that you cannot do recharge on this site and that they can address the water quality. They believe they can make a case to DCA. An above ground detention basin is supported. Engineer Roseberry offered to work with the County regarding the "pit" they are requesting in the hope that the area can be regraded. All expressed concern about the pit being 4 feet deep at a school.

A discussion of lighting took place with the observation that once leaves fall in the winter you would be able to see the lights. The lights will shine down and shields can be put on the lights. Standard utility lights of about 30 feet would be used. Engineer Roseberry suggests lowering the fixtures and adding more poles to the area. The school agreed that the request is reasonable and they will comply. Shoebox lights are a suggestion but adding to the berms was not as favorable. Engineer Roseberry is in favor of adding more dirt to the front of the project.

The board questions included asking about the proposal being 55 and yet the net increase being 41 spaces, the curb being concrete, the discrepancy between 12” and 14” as required by the County, additional Stormwater concerns with the Stormwater Management NOT being consistent with the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Engineer Roseberry explained that he is protecting the Township in the conversations regarding Stormwater Management. In regards to Water Quality, it was explained that the DEP worked with Stormwater manufacturers for structures which have a tendency to be expensive which would be a concern in a school budget. The County did not think it was important as their concerns were that the school did not cause flooding downstream. Engineer Roseberry said that the County only reviews for flow. More conversations took place with Attorney Sullivan stating he believes the issue is more of a permit issue and that the professionals stated it is not technically possible to do recharge.

The school discussion was open to the public for public comment.

Ted Harwick – Bellis Road - - questions about the elevation curb path, the slope and grade of the driveway, and adding fill.

Ken Grisewood – Milford Warren Glen Road - - explained that he lives to the south and asked about the one way circulation, changing the parking to be angled (the applicant actually liked the idea and thought losing two more spots was reasonable), more screening up front and it’s concerning how schools are exempt to a degree and that the board and public have no real say. The Stormwater drains into a C1 Stream and should be reviewed. Stormwater should have been budgeted into the project just like you do for any project. We are not in favor of raising tax dollars but a project should be done properly.

The public comment was closed.

No additional discussions took place.

A motion was made by Dan Bush an seconded my Mike Keady to have Attorney Gallina and Engineer Roseberry prepare a letter/resolution expressing that the project is consistent with the Master Plan but that a waiver to the Site Plan requirement is not granted and that additional screening, angling the parking lot and lowering the light poles, changing the lights and adding some additional lighting should be a implemented along with Engineer Roseberry talking with the County to discuss another option to the 4’ pit. At a roll call vote, all present were in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

DCA will need a letter or copy of a resolution from the Planning Board in order to move forward. The Department of Education (DOE) gets notice that we received this so the letter or resolution needs to be sent as well. The school is looking to start the project ASAP and to be completed by September 1, 2019.

Completeness Review:

There was no Completeness Reviews scheduled to discuss.

Resolution

There were no resolutions scheduled to discuss.

Public Hearings

There was no Public Hearing scheduled to discuss.

Sub-Committee Status and Updates:

Nothing to report at this time.

Board Member Discussion:

There was nothing to report at this time.

Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

Executive Session

There was no Executive Session scheduled at this time.

Adjournment

Dan Bush made a motion to adjourn. Motion approved. The meeting ended at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Elena Jennette Kozak

Maria Elena Jennette Kozak

Secretary